REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 3, 12, 13 and 18 are amended to more clearly define the invention.

The specification is amended to correct typographical errors.

Support for the amendment to the claims indicating a server address/name is changed, advantageously avoiding access to a switch processor communicating with the server, is found on page 19 lines 16-23 and other places ("Changing the file name in this manner does not require the server administrator to directly access the switch 102 because the file name is changed in the server farm. Changing the file name in this manner simplifies life for the server administrators and permits a separation of tasks between the server administrators in charge of the servers 103 and the network administrators in charge of the switch 102 who are responsible for a wider range of customers").

I. Specification.

The disclosure is objected to because of incorrect number 300 on page 11 line 20 and use of the word "names" on page 12 line 6.

The identified informalities have been corrected in conformance with the Examiner's suggestions by changing 300 to 200 and replacing "names" with "name". Consequently withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application 2002/0169889 - Yang et al. These claims, as amended, are deemed to be patentable for the reasons given below.

Amended claim 1 recites a "data switching system for directing requests to initiate a new operation session of an executable application" comprising "a switch processor for, parsing received data representing a received URL to identify whether said received URL is associated with a request to initiate an operation session of an executable application, and if said received URL is associated with a request to initiate an operation session, initiating a data access request at a second URL address

hosted by a particular server; and in response to receiving a response indicating failure of said data access request at said second URL address hosted by said particular server, directing said request to initiate said operation session of said executable application to a server other than said particular server, said failure resulting from a change of destination address stored in said particular server made without accessing said switch processor". These features are not shown (or suggested) in the cited reference.

The system advantageously enables a user to "change" a "destination address stored in said particular server made without accessing said switch processor" to direct a "request to initiate said operation session of said executable application to a server other than said particular server". In the system "changing a file name for a server corresponds to changing a destination address for the server (Application page 19 lines 7-8). Further, "Changing the file name in this manner does not require the server administrator to directly access the switch 102 because the file name is changed in the server farm. Changing the file name in this manner simplifies life for the server administrators and permits a separation of tasks between the server administrators in charge of the servers 103 and the network administrators in charge of the switch 102 who are responsible for a wider range of customers. Server administrators may focus on servicing the servers 103 in a manner that is transparent to the client 101, without cooperating with the network administrators" (Application page 19 lines 16-23). The claimed arrangement advantageously enables a user to make a data change on a server (e.g. to switch session operation to a different server) in a server farm, for example, and avoid having to get involved in more complex interaction with a switch processor.

In contrast, Yang teaches use of a "dispatcher 130 shown in the illustrative example of FIG. 1" that "comprises a dispatcher device 131 and a network switching device 132" (para. 0023). Further, "dispatcher 130 **requires** a certain level of **intelligence** to be able to discriminate incoming requests in order to **make routing decisions**. To address this, the present invention provides an **internal** data structure, the URL table" and "dispatcher 130 consults the URL table when assigning an incoming request to one of the back-end servers" (para. 0035). Consequently, Yang teaches the use of a URL table in dispatcher 130 ("a switch processor") to "make routing decisions". Yang teaches use of a "URL table" in a **switch processor** to alter routing. This is in **direct conflict**, with, and **teaches away** from, enabling a user to "change" a "destination address stored in said particular server made **without**

accessing said switch processor". Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of claim
1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) is respectfully requested.

Amended dependent claim 2 is considered to be patentable based on its
dependence on claim 1. Claim 2 is also considered to be patentable because Yang
does not show (or suggest) "said change of destination address stored in said
particular server comprises change of file name of said particular server and said
received URL is at least one of, (a) the same as said second URL and (b) different to
said second URL". Yang does NOT contemplate enabling a user to "change" a
"destination address stored in said particular server made **without accessing said
switch processor**" by "change of **file name** of said particular server and said received
URL is at least one of, (a) the same as said second URL and (b) different to said
second URL". Yang in para. 0031 and 0052 and elsewhere fails to show or suggest
such a feature combination.

Amended dependent claim 3 is considered to be patentable based on its
dependence on claim 1. Claim 3 is also considered to be patentable because Yang
does not show (or suggest) "in response to receiving a response indicating failure of
said data access request at said second URL address hosted by said particular server
resulting from a change of destination address stored in said particular server made
without accessing said switch processor, directing said request to initiate said
operation session of said executable application to a server other than said particular
server" and "in response to receiving a response indicating success of said data access
request at said second URL address hosted by said particular server, directing said
request to initiate said operation session of said executable application to said
particular server". The Yang system fails to show or suggest such features.

Dependent claim 4 is considered to be patentable based on its
dependence on claim 1. Claim 4 is also considered to be patentable because Yang
does not show (or suggest) "said failure response results from a user changing a
destination address **stored in said particular server**, said destination address
corresponding to said second URL address, said failure indicating said particular
server is not accepting requests to initiate an operation session of an executable
application". Yang in para. 0032 discloses use of a URL table in dispatcher 130 (in
"a switch processor") to "make routing decisions" and NOT "changing a destination
address **stored in said particular server**".

Dependent claim 5 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1. Claim 5 is also considered to be patentable because Yang does not show (or suggest) the feature combination of claim 5 in which "said switch processor, parses data representing a URL to identify whether a URL is associated with a data request of a first or different second type, and processes said URL associated data request of a first type differently to a URL associated data request of a second type".

Dependent claim 6 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claims 1 and 5.

Dependent claim 7 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claims 1, 5 and 6. Claim 7 is also considered to be patentable because Yang does not show (or suggest) the feature combination of claim 7 in which "said switch processor parses data representing a URL to identify whether a URL associated data request is of a first type by determining if a URL data field contains an ASP extension". Paragraph 0035 of Yang relied on in the Rejection nowhere suggests identifying whether "a URL data field contains an ASP extension".

Dependent claim 8 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1. Claim 8 is also considered to be patentable because Yang does not show (or suggest) the feature combination of claim 8 in which "said switch processor parses data representing a URL to identify whether a URL is stateless".

Dependent claim 9 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claims 1 and 8. Claim 9 is also considered to be patentable because Yang does not show (or suggest) the feature combination of claim 9 in which "said switch processor determines if a URL is stateless by determining if a URL data field contains at least one of, (a) a .gif extension, (b) a .js extension (c) a .jpeg extension and (d) a .html extension". Paragraph 0035 and 0037 of Yang fail to show or suggest determining "if a URL is stateless by determining if a URL data field contains at least one of, (a) a .gif **extension**, (b) a .js **extension** (c) a .jpeg **extension** and (d) a .html **extension**". There is no mention of such "extension" processing in the cited paragraphs.

Dependent claim 10 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1. Claim 10 is also considered to be patentable because Yang does not show (or suggest) the feature combination of claim 10 in which "said switch

processor redirects a stateless data request directed to said particular server to a server different to said particular server in response to receiving a response indicating failure of said data access request at said second URL address hosted by said particular server" "said failure resulting from a change of destination address stored in said particular server made **without accessing said switch processor**". Paragraph 0025 nowhere shows or suggests such a feature combination.

Dependent claim 11 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1. Claim 11 is also considered to be patentable because Yang does not show (or suggest) the feature combination of claim 11 in which "a URL associated data request of a first type is performable by a particular server and a URL associated data request of a second type is performable by a plurality of different servers". Paragraph 0037 nowhere shows or suggests such a feature combination.

Amended independent claim 12 recites a "system enabling a user to reduce workload of a server to support maintenance of said server" comprising "an interface processor in a particular server for changing a destination address stored in said particular server from a first destination address to a second destination address without accessing a remote switch processor, in response to user command, said change to said second destination address being used to identify said particular server is unavailable for initiation of new operation sessions of applications, receiving a URL request to access data at said first destination address from said switch processor, determining said URL request to access data cannot be accomplished because of said changed destination address and initiating communication of a message identifying failure of said data access request to said switch processor". Claim 12 is considered to be patentable for the reasons given in connection with claim 1 and other reasons.

The system advantageously enables a user to "change" a "destination address stored in said particular server from a first destination address to a second destination address without accessing a remote switch processor" to "to identify said particular server is unavailable for initiation of new operation sessions of applications, receiving a URL request to access data at said first destination address from said switch processor". In the system "changing a file name for a server corresponds to changing a destination address for the server (Application page 19 lines 7-8). Further, "Changing the file name in this manner does not require the server administrator to directly access the switch 102 because the file name is changed in the server farm. Changing the file name in this manner simplifies life for the server

administrators and permits a separation of tasks between the server administrators in charge of the servers 103 and the network administrators in charge of the switch 102 who are responsible for a wider range of customers. Server administrators may focus on servicing the servers 103 in a manner that is transparent to the client 101, without cooperating with the network administrators" (Application page 19 lines 16-23). The claimed arrangement advantageously enables a user to make a data change on a server (e.g. to switch session operation to a different server) in a server farm, for example, and avoid having to get involved in more complex interaction with a switch processor.

In contrast, Yang teaches use of a "dispatcher 130 shown in the illustrative example of FIG. 1" that "comprises a dispatcher device 131 and a network switching device 132" (para. 0023). Further, "dispatcher 130 **requires** a certain level of **intelligence** to be able to discriminate incoming requests in order to **make routing decisions**. To address this, the present invention provides an **internal** data structure, the URL table" and "dispatcher 130 consults the URL table when assigning an incoming request to one of the back-end servers" (para. 0035). Consequently, Yang teaches the use of a URL table in dispatcher 130 ("a switch processor") to "make routing decisions". Yang teaches use of a "URL table" in a **switch processor** to alter routing. This is in **direct conflict**, with, and **teaches away** from, enabling a user to "change" a "destination address stored in said particular server made **without accessing said switch processor**". Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) is respectfully requested.

Amended dependent claim 13 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 12. Claim 13 is also considered to be patentable because Yang does not show (or suggest) "said change of destination address stored in said particular server comprises change of file name of said particular server and said message identifying failure of said data access request indicates said particular server is unavailable for initiation of new operation sessions of applications". Yang does NOT contemplate enabling a user to "change" a "destination address stored in said particular server made **without accessing said switch processor**" by "change of **file name** of said particular server and said received URL is at least one of, (a) the same as said second URL and (b) different to said second URL". Yang in para. 0031 and 0052 and elsewhere fails to show or suggest such a feature combination.

Dependent claim 14 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 12.

Dependent claim 15 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 12.

Dependent claim 16 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 12. Claim 16 is also considered to be patentable because Yang does not show (or suggest) "a display generator for initiating generation of data representing at least one display image enabling user entry of a command changing a destination address stored in said particular server from a first destination address to a second destination address". Yang in paragraph 0032 relied on indicates a "URL table" included in "dispatcher 130" i.e., a "switch processor" is used in assigning requests to a server. This is in direct contrast to the claimed arrangement involving change of "a destination address stored **in said particular server** from a first destination address to a second destination address" and NOT in a "switch processor".

Dependent claim 17 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 12. Claim 17 is also considered to be patentable because Yang does not show (or suggest) "said interface processor in said particular server changes a destination address stored in said particular server from a second destination address to a first destination address, in response to user command, said change to said first destination address being used to identify said particular server is available for initiation of new operation sessions of applications". Yang in paragraphs 0024 and 0025 relied on indicate a "dispatcher 130" i.e., a "switch processor" is used in assigning requests to a server. This is in direct contrast to the claimed arrangement involving change of "a destination address stored **in said particular server**" and NOT in a "switch processor".

III. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application 2002/0112014 - Bennett et al. These claims, as amended, are deemed to be patentable for the reasons given below.

Amended independent claim 18 recites a "user interface system enabling a user to reduce workload of a server to support maintenance of said server" comprising "a display generator for initiating generation of data representing at least one display image, enabling user entry of a command changing a destination address stored in a particular server from a first destination address to a second destination

address without accessing a remote switch processor communicating with said particular server, said change to said second destination address being used to identify said particular server is unavailable for initiation of new operation sessions of applications and in response to failure of said command indicating said failure by an indicator in said at least one display image". Claim 18 is considered to be patentable for the reasons given in connection with claim 1 and other reasons.

The system advantageously enables a user to "change" a "destination address stored in a particular server from a first destination address to a second destination address without accessing a remote switch processor communicating with said particular server". In the system "changing a file name for a server corresponds to changing a destination address for the server (Application page 19 lines 7-8). Further, "Changing the file name in this manner does not require the server administrator to directly access the switch 102 because the file name is changed in the server farm. Changing the file name in this manner simplifies life for the server administrators and permits a separation of tasks between the server administrators in charge of the servers 103 and the network administrators in charge of the switch 102 who are responsible for a wider range of customers. Server administrators may focus on servicing the servers 103 in a manner that is transparent to the client 101, without cooperating with the network administrators" (Application page 19 lines 16-23). The claimed arrangement advantageously enables a user to make a data change on a server (e.g. to switch session operation to a different server) in a server farm, for example, and avoid having to get involved in more complex interaction with a switch processor.

In contrast, Bennett teaches use of techniques "facilitating communication among a plurality of different telecommunication systems (Abstract). Bennett nowhere shows or suggests "changing a destination address stored in a **particular server** from a first destination address to a second destination address without accessing a remote switch processor communicating with said particular server" to "identify said particular server is unavailable for initiation of new operation sessions of applications and in response to failure of said command indicating said failure by an indicator in said at least one display image". Bennett para. 0077 relied on merely discusses determining if a person's phone number is found in routing database 22 of SMS router 24 and if not generates an error message. Bennett nowhere shows, suggests or contemplates "change" of a "destination address stored in a **particular server** from a first destination address to a second destination address **without accessing a remote switch processor** communicating with said particular

server". Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) is respectfully requested.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, applicant submits that this application is in condition for allowance, and favorable reconsideration is requested.

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections, it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's attorney at the phone number below, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

Respectfully submitted,

Alexander J. Burke
Reg. No. 40,425

Date: December 18, 2007

Alexander J. Burke
Intellectual Property Department
Siemens Corporation,
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, N.J. 08830
Tel. 732 321 3023
Fax 732 321 3030